

- (1) **Two kinds of interference: Borrowing vs. substratum change (diagram: 50)**
 - a. Borrowing *into* a native language (37–8) – Surely you can borrow words into L2 as well?
 - Lexical items come first
 - Structural change only with extensive bilingualism and heavy borrowing
 - phonology, syntax before morphology
 - b. Substratum change = Imperfect learning when *shifting* to a target language (39ff)
 - Structural change first: phonology, syntax and sometimes morphology before lexical items
 - Lexical items only for TL gaps

- (2) **Other differences between borrowing and shift**
 - a. Time depth: More change associated with long contact vs. rapid shift (41)
 - b. Bilingualism: More change associated with extensive vs. imperfect bilingualism (41)

Thomason & Kaufman (1988)	Borrowing Maintenance Into L1	vs.	Substratum change Shift Into L2
Van Coetsem (1995)	Less stable elements Borrowing Into dominant language		More stable elements (68ff) Imposition (70ff) Into non-dominant language

- (3) **Interesting points/predictions**
 - a. Lack of loanwords does not imply lack of contact (43)
 - b. Numbers trump prestige (43–45)
 - c. Not mutually exclusive, and both languages may take both roles (45)
- (4) **Possible exceptions**
 - a. Phonology ‘borrowed’ into L1 (42)
 - Maybe TL becomes dominant (van Coetsem 70–71), so this is still phonological transfer from dominant → less dominant language. Hence not really an exception?
 - This might also explain cases where both languages take both roles.
 - b. Early-creolized creoles are an exception in terms of bilingualism, not time depth (41)
 - i. Abrupt creolization with no pidgin stage → more change (48) — Not exactly.
 - More adults (not children) → more change (Haiti vs. Martinique: Singler 1996). It’s certainly rapid change, but not an instant creole: remained L2 for longer.
 - ii. “we believe that, as new linguistic creations, [pidgins] do not represent any kind of transmission, broken or unbroken—neither the tradition of a shifted to TL nor the tradition of a maintained language” (49).
 - But lexical, structural transfer to pidgins? Or is it a question of stability?

(5) Markedness in shift vs. maintenance

- a. Markedness exercises its effect via learning (51, 56)
- b. Shift: Markedness tends to decrease, but can be trumped in moderate-to-heavy interference (51)
 - i. "... shifting speakers are likely to fail to acquire marked features of the TL, and marked features carried over by shifting speakers from their original language are relatively unlikely to spread by imitation to the TL as a whole" (51)
 - ii. Markedness as evaluated by L1 grammar, not cross-linguistic typology (Mufwene 1990)
- c. Maintenance: Effects masked by full bilingualism when structures are perfectly learned (51)
 - Morphology, especially inflection, is protected because it's highly structured (52)
- d. Markedness is predicted to be more important in shift than in maintenance (52)

(6) Typological distance

- a. Dialect interference common but hard to separate from intensity of contact and prestige (53)
- b. Can definitely be trumped in moderate-to-heavy interference, both kinds (53)
- c. Most likely changes
 - i. Phonology: phonemicization of previously non-distinctive phones (54)
 - ii. Morphosyntax: new means of expressing already existing functional categories, or loss of previously existing categories (54)
 - iii. Syntax: word order easiest in both types of interference; other outcomes do occur (55)
- d. Knock-on effects: new (syntactic) strategies replace old (morphological) ones (55)
 - Circular explanation (56)?

(7) Prejudice towards internal factors

- a. Social factors shouldn't be a last resort (57–8). A unified explanation includes *all* factors (61)
- b. Possibilities to take into account
 - i. Contact can motivate *retention* of features (58)
 - ii. The source feature need not match exactly (62)
 - ⇒ But we must identify a source feature and language (64) – and an explanation
- c. Proposal: Sufficiently intense contact confirmed by change in multiple subsystems (60, 64)

References

-
- Coetsem, Frans van (1995). Outlining a model of the transmission phenomenon in language contact. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 84: 63-85.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. (1990). Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in creolistics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12(1): 1–23.
- Singler, John V[ictor] (1996). Theories of creole genesis, sociohistorical considerations, and the evaluation of evidence: The case of Haitian Creole and the relexification hypothesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11(2): 185–230.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; Oxford: University of California Press.